

# A note on the black hole remnant

Li Xiang

Center for Gravity and Relativity, Department of Physics, Nanchang University,  
Nanchang, 330031, Jiangxi province, P. R. China

## Abstract

Analyzing the tunneling probability of a Schwarzschild black hole with a negative log-area correction to Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, I argue that this correction may be closely related to a black hole remnant. The value for the minimal black hole mass is also discussed.

**Keywords:** black hole remnant, tunneling probability, entropy, logarithmic correction

Enlightened by the tunneling scenario[1], Arzano, Medved and Vagenas[2] recently discussed the tunneling probability of a Schwarzschild black hole with the entropy

$$S = \frac{A}{4} + \rho \ln A, \quad (1)$$

where  $\rho$  is a parameter, which is determined by the model considered. It is generally believed that  $\rho$  is negative, if the log term is attributed to the effects of quantum gravity.<sup>1</sup> However, this leads to a difficulty: the tunneling probability

$$\Gamma \sim \left(1 - \frac{\omega}{M}\right)^{2\rho} \exp \left[-8\pi\omega \left(M - \frac{\omega}{2}\right)\right], \quad (2)$$

becomes divergent when the energy of the emitted particles approaches the black hole mass( $\omega \rightarrow M$ ). Thus an arbitrary big black hole could vanish in an instant, which is certainly unacceptable. It has been argued that the problem can be solved by introducing a canonical correction[2], since it compensates for the effect of the negative  $\rho$ . The motivation of this research is to find another possibility of regularizing the explosive probability. As argued in the following, the black hole remnant is a possible answer. In this note, we set  $\rho = -\alpha$ , and then the corrected entropy of a

---

<sup>1</sup>The are some aspects responsible for the logarithmic correction to black hole entropy, such as string theory, loop quantum gravity, generalized uncertainty principle and modified dispersion relation. The relevant literatures have been listed in Refs.[2, 3].

Schwarzschild black hole can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{A}{4} - \alpha \ln A \\ &= 4\pi M^2 - 2\alpha \ln M + \text{const}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $\alpha > 0$ . Correspondingly, the tunneling probability is rewritten as

$$\Gamma \sim \left(1 - \frac{\omega}{M}\right)^{-2\alpha} \exp \left[ -8\pi\omega \left(M - \frac{\omega}{2}\right) \right], \quad (4)$$

which can be bounded by imposing a stricter constraint on the energy of the emitted particles, i.e.,

$$\omega \leq M - M_c. \quad (5)$$

Since  $\omega \geq 0$ , the above inequality means that the black hole mass is required to be greater than a certain scale. In other words, the black hole has a ground state with “zero point” energy  $M_c$ . If so, we must answer two questions: what is the value for  $M_c$ ? how is it associated with the log-area correction?

It has been argued in Ref.[4] that generalized uncertainty principle may prevent the black hole evaporating completely.<sup>2</sup> In order for the entropy to be real, the black hole mass must satisfy  $M \geq \lambda$ , where  $\lambda$  is a parameter which denotes the quantum gravity correction to uncertainty principle.<sup>3</sup> The correction to Bekenstein-Hawking entropy is also related to the parameter  $\lambda$ , although it is not the strict log-area type. This enlightens us that the black hole remnant should be closely related to the correction to entropy, if both are attributed to quantum gravity effects. Let us first follow the line of argument of Ref.[4], and make an observation on the heat capacity of a Schwarzschild black hole with the log-area correction. Starting from (3), we obtain the inverse temperature as follows

$$\beta = T^{-1} = \frac{dS}{dM} = 8\pi M - \frac{2\alpha}{M}. \quad (6)$$

and then the heat capacity is given by

$$C = \frac{dM}{dT} = -\beta^2 \left(8\pi + \frac{2\alpha}{M^2}\right)^{-1}. \quad (7)$$

There is a critical mass scale

$$M_c = \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{4\pi}}, \quad (8)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Ref.[5] has also presented a similar argument, in terms of a modified dispersion relation.

<sup>3</sup>See Refs.[6]–[19] for the sources and details of the generalized uncertainty principle.

at which the heat capacity vanishes. According to the argument of Adler et al[4], the vanishing heat capacity implies a black hole remnant.<sup>4</sup> The minimal mass of the black hole may be given by (8). However, this argument is more or less speculative, because the temperature is ill defined ( $T = \infty$ ) at the critical point. Furthermore, the physical meanings of some thermodynamic quantities become unclear, when the black hole evaporation enters the last stage dominated by quantum gravity effects. Therefore the temperature (6) and the heat capacity (7) may be lost to their usual senses when the black hole mass is close to the critical value. The physical significance of the critical mass  $M_c$  should be revisited by analyzing the black hole's tunneling probability, within the framework of quantum mechanics.

The necessity for the black hole remnant is also derived from the analysis of the divergent behavior of the tunneling probability. In fact, (4) is based on the following formula[1]

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma &= |M_{fi}|^2 \exp(S_f - S_i) \\ &\sim \exp(\Delta S)\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

where the prefactor  $M_{fi}$  denotes the amplitude of the process from an initial state  $|i\rangle$  to the final state  $|f\rangle$ .  $\exp(S_f - S_i)$  is the phase factor, which is determined by the difference between the entropies of the initial and final states.<sup>5</sup> The formula (9) has been verified by many efforts[21]–[27]. Obviously,  $\Gamma \rightarrow \infty$  as  $S_f \rightarrow \infty$ . However, the divergence of the entropy is attributed to two hidden assumptions:(i) the black hole mass is arbitrary; (ii) the formula (3) is always valid for an infinitesimal black hole. Concretely speaking, the formula (3) means

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow 0} S = \infty,\tag{10}$$

which leads to a trouble in explaining the origin of the explosive entropy when the black hole vanishes. Since the entropy measures the number of degrees of freedom, it is hard to understand that infinite number of degrees of freedom can be confined in an object whose energy is almost zero. The simplest solution of this problem is that the black hole mass is bounded by a nonzero value. It also means that there is a mass scale below which the entropy formula (3) is invalid. In the following discussion, I argue that a reasonable value for the critical mass may be given by (8).

---

<sup>4</sup>Recalling a system composed of large number of harmonic oscillators, the heat capacity also vanishes when the system is in the ground state.

<sup>5</sup>In Ref.[20],  $|M_{fi}|$  was supposed to be a constant. It has also been shown that  $|M_{fi}|$  equals unity if WKB approximation is valid. Except this, the more details of  $M_{fi}$  are absent. So the conclusion of this note is mainly obtained by analyzing the phase factor.

When a particle with energy  $\omega$  escapes from the black hole horizon, the tunneling probability is determined by (4), and it can be rewritten as

$$\Gamma \sim \exp(\Delta S) \quad (11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S &= -8\pi\omega \left( M - \frac{\omega}{2} \right) - 2\alpha \ln \left( 1 - \frac{\omega}{M} \right) \\ &= -8\pi M^2 x \left( 1 - \frac{x}{2} \right) - 2\alpha \ln(1 - x), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where  $x = \omega/M$ . On one hand, there is a mass scale below which the above formula fails. On the other hand, the tunneling probability should be bounded when the black hole mass is greater than this scale. This implies the following inequality

$$\Delta S = -8\pi\omega \left( M - \frac{\omega}{2} \right) - 2\alpha \ln \left( 1 - \frac{\omega}{M} \right) \leq 0, \quad (13)$$

which is certainly the simplest manner to bound the tunneling probability. However, it is also based on such a consideration: the black hole entropy should decrease when the particles escape from the horizon, otherwise we are in trouble of the infinite number of degrees of freedom as  $M \rightarrow 0$ . Furthermore, the inequality (13) ensures the positivity of the black hole temperature.<sup>6</sup> Considering the inequality

$$-\ln \left( 1 - \frac{\omega}{M} \right) \leq \frac{\omega}{M - \omega}, \quad (14)$$

we have

$$\Delta S \leq -8\pi\omega \left( M - \frac{\omega}{2} \right) + \frac{2\alpha\omega}{M - \omega}. \quad (15)$$

When the r.h.s of (15) satisfies

$$-8\pi\omega \left( M - \frac{\omega}{2} \right) + \frac{2\alpha\omega}{M - \omega} \leq 0, \quad (16)$$

we obtain

$$\omega \leq \frac{3M - \sqrt{M^2 + 2\alpha/\pi}}{2}. \quad (17)$$

However, (13) is weaker than (17), it is necessary to consider the following inequality

$$-8\pi\omega \left( M - \frac{\omega}{2} \right) + \frac{2\alpha\omega}{M} \leq \Delta S \leq 0, \quad (18)$$

---

<sup>6</sup>As argued in Refs.[1], the  $\omega^2$  term is important for the unitary scenario of black hole evaporation. In order to preserve this term, we should consider (13) instead of the ansatz  $dS/dM \geq 0$ .

and then

$$\omega \leq 2M - \frac{\alpha}{2\pi M}. \quad (19)$$

At first sight, (17) is very different from (19). However, it is interesting that both inequalities mean the same constraint:  $M \geq M_c = \sqrt{\alpha/4\pi}$ , which ensures the positivity of  $\omega$ . Substituting the value for the least mass into the inequality (13), we obtain

$$\Delta S = -2\alpha x \left(1 - \frac{x}{2}\right) - 2\alpha \ln(1-x) \leq 0, \quad (20)$$

where  $x = \omega/M = \omega\sqrt{4\pi/\alpha}$ . Considering the following series

$$\ln(1-x) = -\left(x + \frac{x^2}{2} + \frac{x^3}{3} + \cdots + \frac{x^n}{n} + \cdots\right), \quad (21)$$

the inequality (20) becomes

$$\Delta S = 2\alpha \left(x^2 + \frac{x^3}{3} + \cdots + \frac{x^n}{n} + \cdots\right) \leq 0, \quad (22)$$

which is valid only if  $x = 0$  or  $\omega = 0$ . This is a dramatic result. In other words, no particle is emitted when the black hole mass approaches the critical scale.

Following from the third law of thermodynamics, the entropy vanishes (or approaches a constant) when an object is in the ground state. It is also expected that the entropy approaches a minimum when the black hole ceases evaporating. Thus the minimal probability should be attributed to the direct transition from black hole to its ground state. As an evidence, the tunneling probability without the log-area correction is considered in advance, which is given by[1]

$$\Gamma^* \sim \exp(\Delta S_{BH}), \quad (23)$$

where

$$\Delta S_{BH} = -8\pi\omega \left(M - \frac{\omega}{2}\right). \quad (24)$$

Energy conservation requires the energy of the emitted particles satisfy  $\omega \leq M$ . When the upper bound of  $\omega$  is saturated, the tunneling probability approaches a minimum as follows

$$\Gamma^* \sim \exp(-4\pi M^2) = \exp(-S_{BH}), \quad (25)$$

which gives two hints: (i) the black hole has a ground state denoted by  $M = 0$ ; (ii) it becomes almost impossible that a big black hole vanishes at an instant, since the probability of the

transition is exponentially suppressed by the entropy of the initial state. We should not be surprised by the first hint, because Bekenstein-Hawking entropy is only the contribution of the classical gravitational action of a black hole, whereas the black hole remnant should be attributed to the effects of quantum gravity at the Planck scale. The black hole mass is allowed to be arbitrarily small if we only consider the classical gravity.

Let us come back to (13), and consider the log-area correction again. If the critical mass (8) denotes the ground state of black hole, the minimal tunneling probability should be determined by the maximum energy of the emitted particles

$$\omega = M - M_c. \quad (26)$$

It is just the case, because (26) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial(\Delta S)}{\partial\omega} &= -8\pi(M - \omega) + \frac{2\alpha}{M - \omega} = 0, \\ \frac{\partial^2(\Delta S)}{\partial\omega^2} &= 16\pi > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Correspondingly, the minimal probability is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &\sim \exp \left[ -4\pi(M^2 - M_c^2) - 2\alpha \ln(M_c/M) \right] \\ &= \left( \frac{e}{M_c^2} \right)^\alpha \exp \left[ -4\pi M^2 + 2\alpha \ln M \right] \\ &= \left( \frac{e}{M_c^2} \right)^\alpha \exp(-S) \\ &= \exp [-(S - S_0)] \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where

$$S_0 = 4\pi M_c^2 - 2\alpha \ln M_c, \quad (29)$$

is a constant which is directly related to the coefficient of the log-area correction. Except this constant, the formula (28) has the same form as (25), and the probability of transition to the energy level  $M_c$  is only determined by the initial black hole entropy. This similarity implies that  $M_c$  plays the role of the “zero point” energy of black hole, which is exalted to a nonzero value when the negative log-area correction to Bekenstein-Hawking entropy is considered.

In summary, this note makes some observations on the black hole evaporation with a negative log-area correction to Bekenstein-Hawking entropy.  $M_c$ , as given by (8), is a special mass scale with some interesting properties: (i) both the “inverse temperature” and the “heat

capacity” vanish when the black hole mass approaches it; (ii) the black hole entropy increases with the mass only if the latter is greater than this scale; (iii) no particle is emitted when the black hole mass approaches  $M_c$ , if the tunneling probability is always bounded by (13); (iv)  $M_c$  denotes a final state with the minimum of the transition rate. These properties are dramatic, they should have non-trivial significances for the black hole evolution. In my opinion, they are the natural hints of black hole remnant.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research is supported by NSF of China (Grant Nos. 10663001 and 10373003).

## References

- [1] M. K. Parikh and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85 (2000) 5042, hep-th/9907001; M. K. Parikh, Gen. Rel. Grav. 36 (2004) 2419, hep-th/0405160.
- [2] M. Arzano, A. J. M. Medved and E. C. Vagenas, JHEP 0509 (2005) 037, hep-th/0505266.
- [3] D. N. Page, New J. Phys. 7 (2005) 203, hep-th/0409024.
- [4] R. J. Adler, P. Chen and D. I. Santiago, Gen. Rel. Grav. 33 (2001) 2101, gr-qc/0106080.
- [5] Y. Ling, B. Hu and X. Li, Phys. Rev. D73 (2006) 087702, gr-qc/0512083.
- [6] T. Yoneya, in *Wandering in the fields*, (World Scientific, 1987).
- [7] D. J. Gross and P. F. Mende, Nucl. Phys. B303(1988) 407.
- [8] T. Yoneya, Mod. Phys. Lett. A4 (1989) 1587.
- [9] D.J. Gross, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London A329 (1989) 401, and the earlier references therein.
- [10] G. Venezino, CERN-TH5366/89, and the earlier references therein.
- [11] K. Konishi, G. Paffuti and Provero, Phys. Lett. B234 (1990) 276.
- [12] R. Guida K. Konishi and P. Provero, Mod. Phys. Lett. A6 (1991)1487.
- [13] A. Strominger, hep-th/9110011.

- [14] P. F. Mende, hep-th/9210001.
- [15] M. Maggiore, Phys.Lett. B304 (1993) 65.
- [16] L. J. Garay, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A10(1995) 145, and references cited therein.
- [17] R. J. Adler, D. I. Santiago, Mod. Phys. Lett. A14 (1999) 1371.
- [18] A. Kempf, G. Mangano and R.B. Mann, Phys. Rev. D52(1995) 1108.
- [19] D. V. Ahluwalia, Phys. Letts. A 275 (2000) 31.
- [20] J. D. Bekenstein and V. F. Mukhanov, Phys. Lett. B360 (1995) 7, gr-qc/9505012.
- [21] E. C. Vagenas, Phys.Lett. B559 (2003) 65, hep-th/0209185.
- [22] A. J. M. Medved, Phys. Rev. D66 (2002) 124009, hep-th/0207247.
- [23] W. B. Liu, Phys. Lett. B634 (2006) 541.
- [24] J. Y. Zhang and Z. Zhao, Phys. Lett. B638 (2006) 110, gr-qc/0512153.
- [25] J. Y. Zhang and Z. Zhao, Nucl. Phys. B725 (2005) 173.
- [26] Q. Q. Jiang, S. Q. Wu and X. Cai, Phys. Rev. D73 (2006) 064003, hep-th/0512351.
- [27] S. Q. Wu, Q. Q. Jiang, JHEP 0603 (2006) 079, hep-th/0602033.